

GENERAL LIBRARY
MAR 15 1921
UNIV. OF MICH.

MAR 15 1921

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XIV, No. 18

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1921

WHOLE No. 387

Classical Associations of Places in Italy*

by FRANCES E. SABIN, Assistant Professor of Latin
at the University of Wisconsin

A collection of approximately 600 passages from Greek and Latin authors arranged under the headings of places in Italy with the best available English translation on the opposite page and explanatory notes at the bottom; also a map at the beginning of the book connecting ancient and modern sites, and various illustrations throughout the text in connection with places mentioned.

PURPOSE OF THE BOOK

The book is designed primarily to meet the needs of the intelligent traveler in Italy who wishes to have at hand in some convenient form the classical associations of the places which he visits. But, apart from the purpose of making a trip to Italy more interesting, the book also serves as a collection of passages which set forth the life and thought of the Romans. It will therefore be a useful book for libraries in general and for departments of the Classics and ancient history in particular.

PUBLICATION AND PRICE

Because of the excessive cost of bringing out a book of this character at the present time, it has not seemed advisable to have a large edition printed or to have it handled in the usual way. The publication will consist of 500 copies which will be ready in May. These may be secured at any time previous to this date by sending subscription pledges to Frances Sabin, 405 N. Henry St., Madison, Wis. Price, \$5.00, postpaid.

A descriptive circular containing among other items comments from various classical scholars who have seen the manuscript will be sent upon request.

*The title of this book has been changed from that given in an advertising circular of recent date, where it appears as
THE ROMANS AND PLACES IN ITALY



BREASTED'S ANCIENT TIMES

Makes the stirring events and customs of the past live again before the eyes of the student. The narrative is absorbingly interesting. More than 275 illustrations increase the vividness. These include colored plates, maps, and battle plans.

A standard high-school history, unsurpassed as a reference handbook for classical courses.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue, New York

SMYTH'S GREEK GRAMMAR

By Herbert Weir Smyth, Ph.D., University of Göttingen, Eliot Professor of Greek Literature, Harvard University. Cloth. 506 pages.

THIS BOOK meets the needs of beginners and other young students using a Greek grammar for the first time. It also includes material which is of special service to undergraduates during the earlier period of their study of Greek literature. Its treatment of verbs is excellent.

The book differs from its predecessors of the same class especially in attaching greater importance to exact explanations of phonetic and morphological changes, where such explanations are based on the assured results of recent scientific investigation of the language, and are, at the same time, readily intelligible to younger students. Simplicity of statement is one of the distinctive features of this Grammar.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

The Classical Weekly

Entered as second class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918

VOL. XIV

NEW YORK, MARCH 14, 1921

No. 18

AN ILLUSTRATION OF HORACE, SERMONES 1. 3

In *Sermones* 1.3, Horace begins with an extreme example of that very censoriousness which it is the business of this *Sermo* to combat (1-18. See Greenough's notes). He could be sure that his opening verses would attract attention; compare verses 55 ff., and the spirit of Tacitus, *Agricola* 1.1, especially the last sentence. Having gained the reader's full attention, he passes on then to preach, as he had from the first intended to preach, against censoriousness; if his reader had any conscience at all, his enjoyment of the opening verses would help to emphasize the correctness of the lesson that Horace is seeking to impress upon him. Another example of excessive censoriousness is given in the story about Maenius (21-23). In 21-23 Maenius plays the rôle which Horace himself seemed to be playing in 1-18; it follows, therefore, that the condemnation so unhesitatingly heaped on Maenius, in 24, is a condemnation of such censoriousness as is represented in 1-18. It is convenient for Horace to substitute another, Maenius, for himself, and to make that other, Maenius, take the odium of his condemnation of censoriousness.

At verse 19, Horace sought to make use of the dialogue method, by introducing an imaginary interlocutor. But he does not use the dialogue method very long; from 25 on we have a long monologue. What happens here, in the substitution of monologue for dialogue, is exactly what happens in *Sermo* 1.1. 54ff.: see my remarks in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, xlv, 96. From 25 on, the development of the thought, in the monologue, is as follows:

'Don't keep your gaze fixed so intently on the mote that is in some other man's eye that you cannot see the beam that is in your own (25, to *Epidaurius*, 27); bear in mind that others can see this beam if you cannot (*at tibi . . . illi*, 27-28). Think of the other man's good points, not of his failings (29-*corpore*, 34), bearing in mind always your own shortcomings (*demi-que . . . agris*, 34-37). In regard to the failings of others, act as the lover acts, or as the father acts; in a word, underestimate rather than overestimate the failings of others' (49-54).

I want to dwell a little while on verses 28-34:

Iracundior est paulo, minus aptus acutis
naribus horum hominum; rideri possit eo quod
rusticius tonso toga defluit, et male laxus
in pede calceus haeret: at est bonus, ut melior vir
non alius quisquam, at tibi amicus, at ingenium ingens
inculto latet hoc sub corpore.

The words *minus aptus acutis naribus horum hominum* (29-30) describe a man as "scarce fit to face the polished banter of the men of our day" (so Palmer).

The opposite of the phrase, *naribus acutis*, is found in Horace himself, in *Epodes* 12. 3. This *Epode* is a lampoon on a woman whose advances had become repulsive. Verses 1-3 run as follows:

Quid tibi vis, mulier nigris dignissima barris?
Munera cur mihi quidve tabellas
mittis, nec firmo iuveni neque naribus obesae?

For a commentary on both phrases, *acutis naribus* and *naribus obesae*, we need look no further than Horace himself, *Epodes* 12. 4 *Namque sagacius unus odoror*, etc.

Two other passages of Horace are in point. One is *Sermones* 1. 6.1-6 (the passage which contains the famous phrase *naso suspendis adunco*). The other is *Epistles* 1. 19.45-46. This letter is, as is well known, in part Horace's rejoinder to his critics, in part an expression of his scorn of those who imitated him. In verses 41-49 he declares that his critics ridicule his modesty as affected. He declines to cross swords with them, since the combat could lead only to ill feeling. His avoidance of the contest is set forth in the following words (45-47):

Ad haec ergo naribus uti
formido, et, luctantis acuto ne secer ungui,
"Displicet iste locus" clamo et diludia posco.

With *Sermones* 1.6.5 *naso suspendis adunco*, we may compare *Sermones* 2.8.64, *Balathro suspendens omnia naso*.

Less germane to our discussion, though it is cited by Wilkins, on *Epistles* 1.19.45, is *Epistles* 1.5.21-23. But no doubt the reader is thinking, by this time, of a better parallel, the well known verses of Martial 1.3.1-6:

Argiletanas mavis habitare tabernas,
cum tibi, parve liber, scrinia nostra vacent.
Nescis, heu, nescis dominae fastidia Romae:
crede mihi, nimium Martia turba sapit.
Maiores nusquam rhonchi: iuvenesque senesque
et pueri nasum rhinocerotis habent.

Various other passages of Martial are in point: 1.41
18 non cuicumque datum est habere nasum; 5.19.17
iam dudum tacito rides, Germanice, naso, utile quod
nobis do tibi consilium; 4.86. 7 nec rhonchos metues
maligniorum. We may note, too, the adjective
nasutus, which occurs, for instance, in Martial 2.54. 5 nil
nasutus hac maligniusque; 12.37 nasutus nimium
cupis videri: nasutum volo, nolo polyposum; 12. 88
Tongilianus habet nasum: scio, non nego. Sed iam
nil praeter nasum Tongilianus habet; 13.2.1-10.

I do not choose, however, nor do I consider it necessary, to illustrate our Horatian passage further from Latin authors. I merely remind the reader of the familiar cognomina *Nasica* and *Naso*.

Of what precedes I was reminded, by finding recently, among my clippings, one from the New York Sun, of Saturday, April 9, 1898. The clipping, which covers half a column, consists of an extract, apparently, from *The Lancet* (London), which runs as follows:

The nose has at all periods of their history possessed a peculiar significance for Italians. As a symbol of intelligence it figures in familiar speech, ancient and modern, a *homo nasutissimus* being Seneca's equivalent for a very clever man, and *Naso* a name held in honor by the Otacilian, Octavian, Ovidian, and Voconian gentes, while *Nasica* was a cognomen of the Scipios. . . . In the Italy of to-day *aver naso* and *esser di buon naso*. . . . are the first of a series of phrases all turning on that feature in its symbolic sense and giving rise to proverbs infinite in the variety of their applications. The great Napoleon was true to his Italian origin in his preference for a "big nose", and the late Lord Beaconsfield, descended from Venetian Jews, never concealed his scorn for the "flat-nosed Frank". He held, in fact, that to be *simus* was the first step toward being a *simia*. . . . Such a horror have Italians of any lesion costing the face its nose or robbing the latter of its due proportions that rhinoplasty among them has long been one of the "surgical fine arts", and the great Bolognese anatomist Tagliacozzi (1546-99) has for all time given his name to an ingenious method of replacing the feature when lost. Quite in keeping, therefore, with all precedent as well as with the fitness of things, it is in Italy that we have "the cult of the nose", as vital as ever, inasmuch that within the last seven years she has had two *Concorsi di Nasi* (or nose competitions), in which the owners of the feature received prizes according as they could present it in greatest perfection as regards type, size, beauty, and olfactory power. The former of these *Concorsi* was held in 1891 at Padua on the initiative of the students of that medical school, and the citizens were invited, by universal suffrage and secret voting, to name the possessors of *i nasi piu sviluppati e rispettabili* (noses the most pronounced and respectable) of the ancient Venetian town. The prizes, consisting of pocket handkerchiefs and snuff boxes, were in due course awarded by plurality of votes.

At Milan, and quite recently, a much better ordered and more conclusive competition of the same kind has just come off, the whole proceedings being controlled by a committee and the "examinations" conducted in a *Nasotecca* furnished with drawings and water colors of heads well provided with noses, such as would have gladdened the artistic sense of William Hogarth. The competitors numbered thirty-six, but not more than twenty-three appeared before the examiners. The first prize (gold medal) was won by a Venetian . . . a vender of lucifers, whose nose was found to be of "formidable proportions, long, well-pronounced, aggressive, trenchant like a knife blade". The second prize fell to . . . , possessed of a nose "domineering, assuming, with nostrils wide and cavernous". . . . the third prize was adjudged to . . . for the refined, symmetrical proportions of his nasal feature. The last two prizes. . . were given for a nose "without pretension, ingenuous, but solid and well planted", and for one "considerable, regular, and worthy of respect". C. K.

SOME SPHERES OF ROMAN ORIGINALITY

I

The Romans were unfortunate in coming after the Greeks and so finding certain fields already occupied. If we look only at certain points, we should be inclined to believe that they were only shadows of the Greeks. This, we should say, is a translation, or at best an adaptation, of a Greek work; here is a form borrowed outright, or only slightly modified; for the origin of this construction, see this or that Greek writer. While these are outstanding features in the field of literary expression, there are certain spheres in which the Romans worked unaffected by anything that the Greeks had done. Because of this it is necessary to consider different spheres of non-influence, as well as of influence. The former made up a larger part of Roman life than did the latter, for in (1) agriculture, (2) law, and (3) war the Romans solved their own problems in their own way. In some far-off age, Grecian and Roman systems might have had a common source, but of this the Romans knew nothing, and in each of these three spheres there were centuries of development within the Italian environment before the Romans came in contact with the Greeks.

(1) At the beginning of his work on Agriculture, Varro invokes the aid of twelve gods and goddesses, not those whose statues stand gilded in the Forum, but those that are especially leaders of the farmers—Sky father (Jupiter), and Mother Earth, the Sun and the Moon, whose seasons are observed when certain things are sown or garnered; Ceres and Liber, whose fruits are necessary for living; Rust (Robigus) and Flora; Minerva and Venus, to one of whom belongs the superintendence of olive-orchards, to the other that of vineyards; and also Water (Lympha) and Good Luck (Bonus Eventus), for without water agriculture is arid and pitiable, and without Good Luck it is not husbandry, but disappointment. These gods were not like those of Germany, who, Tacitus says (Germania 9), could be seen *sola reverentia*; they were workers for men, and the outgrowth of the thought of Italians working in an Italian environment.

After the invocation, Varro mentions about fifty Greek writers, but lays special emphasis on the work of Mago the Carthaginian. The value of their works is stated by Stolo, and his words are an interesting revelation of the real attitude of the speakers (1.5.2):

Isti . . . libri non tam idonei iis qui agrum colere volunt quam qui scholas philosophorum; neque eo dico, quo <non> habeant et utilia et communia quaedam.

This statement does not differ much from that of Cicero, *De Oratore* 1.249:

Num igitur, si qui fundus inspiciendus aut si mandandum aliquid procuratori de agri cultura aut imperandum vilico est, Magonis Karthaginensis sunt libri perdiscendi, an hac communi intelligentia contenti esse possumus?

Greek methods are occasionally mentioned by Varro, but this is simply for illustration, as the Roman Cato is preferred to all others (1.2.28):

An non in magni illius Catonis libro, qui de agri cultura est editus, scripta sunt permulta similia, ut haec, quem ad modum placentam facere oporteat, quo pacto libum, qua ratione pernas sallere?

This supremacy of the Roman farmer is paralleled by the supremacy of Roman agriculture. The superiority of Italy is set forth in the following questions (1.2.6):

Contra quid in Italia utensile non modo non nascitur, sed etiam non egregium fit? quod far conferam Campano? quod triticum Apulo? quod vinum Falerno? quod oleum Venafro? non arboribus consita Italia, ut tota pomarium videatur? an Phrygia magis vitibus cooperta, quam Homerus appellat ἀμπελόεσσα, quam haec? aut <triticum> Argos, quod idem poeta πολύπυρον? in qua terra iugerum unum denos et quinos denos culleos fert vini, quot quaedam in Italia regiones?

The spirit of the work of Columella is the same as that of Varro, and in both writers the native character of agriculture is shown by the fact that from its different phases were derived the names of some of the noblest Roman families. The Carthaginians and the Greeks might be more learned in their studies, yet the practical is of far more value than is the theoretical. As a further indication of this, see Cicero, Cato Maior 53-54:

Quid de utilitate loquar stercorandi? . . . de qua doctus Hesiodus ne verbum quidem fecit, cum de cultura agri scriberet.

Taken as a whole the results were due solely to the Romans with their native endowment of common sense, working within an Italian environment, under a Roman sun, and guided by a Roman moon.

(2) In an interesting excursus (9.17-19), Livy discusses the probable outcome, si invictus Alexander cum invictis ducibus bella gessisset. Professor W. B. Anderson argues (Transactions of the American Philological Association 39.89 ff.) that this was a youthful exercise carried over by Livy to his history. But whether it was the expression of youthful, or of mature, feeling, it gives the prevalent view in regard to the self-sufficiency of the Romans in the matter of war. Livy considers the equipment, the flexibility of the Roman line, as well as other items, all of which, he declares (9.17.3), facile praestant invictum Romanum imperium. This discussion anticipates the statement of the results of the struggle between the Romans and the Macedonians on the invasion of Greece. After the first clash, Philip of Macedon ordered the fallen Greeks to be transferred to his own camp that the honors of burial might be seen by all. But as Livy says (31.34.3), nihil tam incertum nec tam inestimabile est quam animi multitudinis. When they saw the bodies cut to pieces by the Spanish swords, arms lopped from the shoulder, and heads struck from the body, they

realized with what kind of men they had to fight. Florus also has a brief description of the scene (2.7.9):

Nihil terribilius Macedonibus fuit ipso vulnerum aspectu, quae non spiculis nec sagittis nec ullo Graeculo ferro, sed ingentibus pilis nec minoribus adacta gladiis ultra mortem patebant.

Notice also a similar note of exultation where we might little expect to find it. Quintilian, after mentioning musical instruments, has the following (1.10.14):

Quid autem aliud in nostris legionibus cornua ac tubae faciunt, quorum concentus quanto est vehementior, tantum Romana in bellis gloria ceteris praestat?

Throughout Roman history the steady widening of power was rarely interrupted by some Trasumene or Cannae, 'memorable among the few disasters of the Roman people', and there are no indications of any loss of faith in the means that were used. No better evidence of this can be offered than the Strategemata of Frontinus, and the Epitome Rei Militaris of Flavius Vegetius Renatus. The first pictures the Romans as masters of nearly every form of work and of wile, while the latter shows them as victors over Gauls, Germans, Africans, and Greeks, as the nation which had subdued the entire world (1.1), armorum exercitio, disciplina castrorum usuque militiae.

(3) There is a good old story that the Romans sent into Greece for material to round out the corpus of the law in the Twelve Tables. Pomponius, in Dig. 1.2.2.3-4, says that some report that the adviser of the Decemvirs was a certain Hermodorus of Ephesus, then an exile at Rome. Other writers, e.g. Livy 3.31-32, and Servius on Vergil, Aen. 7.695, mention an embassy sent to investigate the laws of Grecian cities, and especially those which Solon had given to Athens. Yet in fact the foreign influence was trifling, and without effect on the private portions of the code. The *ius quiritorium*, and its accompaniment, the *supplicium de more maiorum* (see Professor W. A. Oldfather, Transactions of the American Philological Association 39.49 ff.), came from a time far antedating any influence by the Greeks.

Gaius 1.1.2, and Justinian, Institutiones 1.2.3, say that the Roman law is either *scriptum* or *non scriptum*. The former is made up of lex, plebiscita, senatus consulta, principum placita, magistratuum edicta, responsa prudentium. All these were the product of *Romanus communis sensus* working on the problems furnished by Roman conditions. The unwritten law is that which *usus* has approved. Of the same import is what Justinian says (Inst. 1.2.11): Sed naturalia quidem iura. . . divina quadam providentia constituta semper firma atque immutabilia permanent. And this too is an expression of the genius of the Roman people working with Roman material.

There are two pieces of information in Gaius which we quote because of their interpretative character. His comment on *patria potestas* is as follows (1.55): Pere enim nulli alii sunt homines, qui talem in filios

suos habent potestatem qualem nos habemus. The antecedent condition of this is *conubium*, with the attendant rite *confirratio*, both for the purpose of maintaining the original religious character of the family. Even though the germ of the original gentile organization may have been in some remote Indo-European period, the Romans knew nothing of this, and were left entirely to themselves in solving the problem of the incorporation of the plebian element into the State. The second interesting remark of Gaius is on the word *spondeo*, which was a necessary part of every verbal agreement (3.93):

At illa verborum obligatio *dari spondes? spondeo adeo propria civium Romanorum est, ut ne quidem in Graecum sermonem per interpretationem proprie transferri possit, quamvis dicatur a Graeca voce figurata esse.*

As the Roman State was continually facing new problems because of the extension of her boundaries, there were certain modifications of the *ius civile* through the influence of the *ius gentium* and the edicts of the *praetor peregrinus*. These modifications may have been helped by the influence of the Stoic philosophy. Yet at the same time we must bear in mind that Stoic teachings, if admitted by the Romans, were absorbed, assimilated, and transformed, and when expressed in life bore the stamp of Roman originality. But far back of this imported philosophy was a practical Roman philosophy of life. For this phase of the question we may accept the statement of Professor J. B. Moyle, Justinian, Institutes I, Introduction 16:

Hence is inferred a fact. . . that in the earliest period of the nation's history almost every relation with which jurisprudence has ever had any concern was dominated by public law, or by the idea, expressing itself in law, that beside, or apart from, the state, the citizen is as nothing, and that he has no ground of complaint if his family life, his religion, his dealings with his fellow men, his very life and liberty, are treated principally as a means to an end in government, and placed under state control. . . . It is, the view of many who have deeply studied the institutions of Rome that, in its infancy, the consciousness of the people as a military state, which had perpetually to be defending its very existence with the sword, asserted itself so irresistibly as to colour the law of Rome to the very end of its history.

Farmers at home, warriors abroad, and original in both spheres, in the development of the laws by which they sought to establish harmonious relations for all they were as Roman as they were in the rules of agriculture.

II

In agriculture, war, and law, the Romans were continually enlarging their experiences through their native talent, and by means of native material. It was always *patrius progressus*, always on a Roman basis, and there was ever some expression of *vis Romana*. To us the most noticeable form of this expression is the *vita urbana*. In this life, Roman writers and speakers lived and moved and had their being, and these men are

the ones who, for the most part, furnish to students and teachers alike the material from which, to a great extent, the Romans are judged. Their works illustrate Grecian forms, and are permeated with Grecian coloring; yet the substance of the greater part of this work was purely Roman. One of the best illustrations of this is Roman satire, of which Quintilian writes (10. 1.93), *Satura quidem tota nostra est*. This was original, not in form (*horridus ille defluxit numerus Saturnius*, Horace, Epp. 2.1.158-159), but in content. Its beginnings were far back in Roman life, and its characters, gnarled or knotty, light or lewd or lustful, are representatives of a real Roman life. Sarmenius and Messius Cicirrus (Horace, Sermon. 1.5.52), as well as the characters in Petronius, are not artistic creations, but men of flesh and blood whose psychic prototypes long preceded any form of dramatic *satura*. This may have been permeated with Grecian coloring, but not so the basic Roman satire. There is a similar contrast in the original and developed practice of medicine.

The first words of the *De Medicina* of Celsus are these: *Ut alimenta sanis corporibus agricultura, sic sanitatem aegris medicina promittit*. He then proceeds to acknowledge at length the debt of the Romans to the Greeks. The works of Marcellus and of Cassius Felix give evidence of the same obligations. We might conclude that medicine among the Romans was merely a Grecianized art. But listen to the evidence in regard to Roman practice given by Pliny, N. H. 29.11:

Mutatur aërs cotidie totiens interpolis, et ingeniorum Graeciae flatu impellimur, palamque est, ut quisque inter istos loquendo polleat, imperatorem ilico vitae nostrae necisque fieri, cui vero non milia gentium sine medicis degant nec tamen sine medicina, sicuti populus Romanus ultra sex centesimum annum, neque ipse in accipiendis artibus lentus, medicinae vero etiam avidus, donec expertam damnavit.

The last statement is explained in Section 13, where we are told of the welcome given to the first Greek doctor:

Vulnerarium eum fuisse tradunt e re dictum, mireque gratum adventum eius initio, mox a saevitia secandi urendique transisse nomen in carnificem et in taedium artem omnesque medicos.

The proof of the latter statement is a quotation from the Elder Cato (14):

Dicam de istis Graecis suo loco, Marce fili. Quid Athenis exquisitum habeam et quod bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere, vincam. Nequissimum et indocile genus illorum, et hoc puta vatem dixisse: quandoque ista gens litteras dabit, omnia corrumpet, tum etiam magis, si medicos suos huc mittet. Iurarunt inter se barbaros necare omnes medicina, et hoc ipsum mercede faciunt, ut fides iis sit et facile disperdant. Nos quoque dictitant barbaros et spurcius nos quam alios opicos appellatione foedant. Interdixi tibi de medicis.

Cato scorned not remedies, but doctors, for he goes on to give the means by which he had prolonged his own life and his wife's to extreme old age; and, by way of comment, Pliny adds (16): *Non rem antiqui damna-*

bant, sed artem, maxime vero quaestum esse manipetio vitae recusabant. The continuing Roman attitude is shown by the words (17), Solam hanc artium Graecarum nondum exercet Romana gravitas. . . .

In the field of literature it seems far different. Livius Andronicus produced an Odyssey by translation, and Vergil an Aeneid by imitation. Plautus and Terence give us Grecian comedies, and Seneca, Grecian tragedies, while it is the boast of Horace (Carm. 3.30.13) that he fitted Grecian measures to Italian poetry. Yet, admitting all this, we must still emphasize the contrast between the form and the substance.

We have more of the literary work of Cicero than of any other Roman. Both his narrative and his critical portions must be considered. Professor Tyrrell, Correspondence of Cicero 1³, Introduction, 83, makes this statement:

In the criticism of Cicero's letters we may . . . say that to quote an analogous usage in Plautus or Terence is far more relevant than to quote an analogous usage from the Oratory or Philosophy of Cicero himself.

Cicero's Letters smack of the *sermo vulgaris*, and at the same time reveal somewhat of the influence of Greek on the expressional phases of the *vita urbana*. They are fairly thickset with Greek expressions, some of which seem to have been used to supply deficiencies in the Latin language, while others are interpreted by Professor Tyrrell (85 ff.) as current slang. They are little bubbles on the surface of society expression, and are in strong contrast with the Latin fiber in his other works.

The Orations of Cicero are Roman, through and through, and this was necessary, for, speaking to persuade, he was compelled to use Roman material to influence Roman minds. The oration for Archias, it is true, has a Grecian flavor, but this begins only after the words *causa dicta est*. The Dialogus De Oratoribus declares (37.28), Catilina et Milo et Verres et Antonius hanc illi famam circumdederunt, and they do so because of their profusion in the things that are Roman. In proof of this we may quote a passage from Longinus, De Sublimitate 12.2 and 4, in the translation by W. Rhys Roberts:

With his vast riches Plato swells like some sea, which expands on every side. . . . He <Demosthenes>, owing to the fact that he can as it were consume by fire and carry away all before him, may be compared to a thunderbolt or flash of lightning. Cicero, on the other hand, it seems to me, after the manner of a wide spread conflagration, rolls on with all-devouring flames, having within him an ample and abiding store of fire, distributed now at this point now at that, and fed with unceasing succession.

In a word, Demosthenes has passion, Cicero profusion. This is the synthetic judgment of a Greek, and is not suggestive of a single Grecian element in the Roman orator. When we pick the elements of Cicero's oratory, we find them all Roman—an orator trained Non in libellis, sed in maximis causis et in hoc domicilio imperii et gloriae (De Oratore 1.105); working in foro causisque

civilibus (Orator 69); and not using Nitidum quoddam genus verborum et laetum, sed palaestriae magis et olei quam huius civilis turbae ac fori (De Oratore 1.81).

These orations are illustrations of Cicero's theory of eloquence as set forth in his rhetorical works. He declares (De Oratore 1.54): Hoc enim est proprium oratoris. . . oratio gravis et ornata et hominum sensibus ac mentibus accommodata. In De Oratore 3.137 he states that, in the attainment of this end, Ut virtutis a nostris, sic doctrinae sunt ab illis exempla petenda, that is, the Greeks can teach us how to set forth native material. Of the latter he gives his views as follows (De Oratore 1.195):

Fremant omnes licet, dicam quod sentio: bibliothecas omnium philosophorum unus mihi videtur XII Tabularum libellus, si quis legum fontes et capita viderit, et auctoritatis pondere et utilitatis ubertate superare.

It is not strange that he believed this, for he declares (De Oratore 1.15),

Ingenia vero, ut multis rebus possumus iudicare, nostrorum hominum ceteris hominibus omnium gentium praestiterunt.

Again, in Brutus 138, he names Demosthenes and Hyperides, and then passes to Antony and Crassus, declaring

Nam ego sic existimo, hos oratores fuisse maximos et in his primum cum Graecorum gloria Latine dicendi copiam aequatam.

By the side of this we place the characterization in De Oratore 3.28:

Suavitatem Isocrates, subtilitatem Lysias, acumen Hyperides, sonitum Aeschines, vim Demosthenes habuit. Quis eorum non egregius? Tamen quis cuiusquam nisi sui similis? Gravitatem Africanus, lenitatem Laelius, asperitatem Galba, profluens quidam habuit Carbo et canorum.

Here, over against five Greeks, with Demosthenes as the last, he places four Romans, leaving, though he is unnamed, a place for Marcus Tullius Cicero. What Cicero did not do for himself, Quintilian did for him (10.1.108): Nam mihi videtur M. Tullius. . . effinxisse vim Demosthenis, copiam Platonis, iucunditatem Isocratis. Shall we reject or modify this judgment as due to patriotic partiality? No. It assigns even less power to the Roman orator than is assigned to him by Longinus, in the passage already quoted.

If there had not been a Greek philosophy, there might not have been any abstract Roman philosophy. In this field, in which Cicero wrote so much and accomplished so little, there seems outwardly to be little that is not Greek. Yet the loss of Cicero's De Republica and his De Legibus is one of the greatest among the great losses of Roman literary material. In these works, Cicero wrote not of a State that might be, but of one that had been built by Romans, and out of Roman materials. To write of this was to set forth a philosophy, not of the ideal, but of the real. The same color of Roman realism is in all his other philosophical works. He believed that philosophy was a knowledge

of human and of divine affairs, and of the causes by which these were maintained, and its greatest work was to set forth the precepts of living honorably. But he cared less for precepts than for practice, and, when he wrote the *De Officiis* for his son, he used Panaetius merely as a framework for the expression of what was practically beneficial to a Roman. Like Seneca, he used the terms of the Greeks, but these were conditioned by the Roman temperament and by Roman activities which determined the *praecepta*, quae imperant in actu mori (Seneca, *Epp.* 8.1).

III

Criticism reveals itself in its portrayal of others, and the Romans, characterizing the Greeks, showed forth themselves. It was because of their inherent *virtus* that they saw so clearly the weaknesses of the Greeks. Cicero himself is seen in the words to be found in *Brutus* 121, *Quis uberior in dicendo Platone? . . . Quis Aristotele nervosior, Theophrasto dulcior?* Criticism also reveals the external, as does Quintilian, when in 10.1 he shows the descent from Theophrastus (83), *nitor ille divinus*, Pindar (61), *velut quodam eloquentiae flumine*, Thucydides and Herodotus (73), *densus et brevis et semper instans sibi Thucydides, dulcis et candidus et fusus Herodotus*, to Apollonius (54), *aequali quadam mediocritate*, Timagenes (75), *intermissam historias scribendi industriam nova laude reparavit*, and Clitarchus (74), *probatur ingenium, fides infamatur*. These characterizations are a practical illustration of the truth of the words of Munro, *Lucretius*, Volume 2, Introduction, 10:

But hardly had Demosthenes and Aristotle ceased to live, when that Attic which had been gradually formed into such a noble instrument of thought in the hands of Aristophanes Euripides Plato and the orators and had superseded for general use all the other dialects, became at the same time the language of the civilized world, and was stricken with a mortal decay. It seems to have been too subtle and delicate for any but its wonderful creators.

The writers of the Augustan age wrote among the evidences of this decay, and we may well believe that it was an influence tending to make them rely more and more on their native resources. This was especially true of Cicero and of Livy. Notice the words of Munro (*ibidem*):

Epicurus who was born in the same year as Menander writes a harsh jargon that does not deserve to be called a style. . . . Polybius Chrysippus Philodemus are little if at all better. When Cicero deigns to translate any of their sentences, see what grace and life he instils into their clumsily expressed thoughts! How satisfying to the ear and taste are the periods of Livy when he is putting into Latin the uncouth clauses of Polybius!

There were, then, two influences, the attractive and the repellent, at work among the Romans. Cicero states (*Brutus* 67) that *subtilitas* was specifically Attic. *Subtilis Graecia*, says Manilius (4.720), while Pliny, *N.H.* 18.335, has, *Aristoteles, vir immensae subtilitatis*,

and Seneca, *N. Q.* 7.3.2, says *Democritus subtilissimus antiquorum*. In contrast with these terms are *sublimis* and *sublimitas*, which are not used by Cicero or by Caesar, but were brought in as critical terms during the first century A.D. The use of them by the Romans is an indication of the ready acceptance by them of Grecian tests as the measure of their own literary products. While accepting new measurements for their own work, they at the same time applied their own to the activities of the Greeks, and were free in their condemnations. Notice the assumed judgment of a declaimer as given by Petronius 2:

Nuper ventosa istaec et enormis loquacitas Athenas ex Asia commigravit animosque iuvenum ad magna surgentes veluti pestilenti quodam sidere afflavit, semelque corrupta regula eloquentia stetit et obmutuit. Ad summam, quis postea Thucydidis, quis Hyperidis ad famam processit? Ac ne carmen quidem sani coloris enituit, sed omnia quasi eodem cibo pasta non potuerunt usque ad senectutem canescere.

Juvenal (3.60) gives as his general attitude, *non possum ferre, Quirites, Graecam urbem*. The Greeks are *adulandi gens prudentissima* (86), and, though Greek actors personate a woman to the very life, still the best of them do not do more than every Greek can do. The entire force of his scorn is shown in 73 ff.:

Ingenium velox, audacia perdita, sermo promptus et Isaeo torrentior. Ede, quid illum esse putes. Quemvis hominem secum attulit ad nos: grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes, augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus, omnia novit Graeculus esuriens: in caelum, iusseris, ibit.

The Greekling! This one word gives as definitely the Roman view of the Greek as do the words *Punica fides* the Roman view of the Carthaginian. It is used more than once by Cicero: compare *De Oratore* 1.47 *Verbi enim controversia iam diu torquet Graeculos homines contentiois cupidiores quam veritatis*; 1.102 *Quid? mihi vos nunc, inquit Crassus, tamquam alicui Graeculo otioso et loquaci et fortasse docto atque erudito quaestiunculam. . . . ponitis?* In 1.221 the orator is urged so to act that men will not think him skillless and a Greekling; compare *Tusc. Disp.* 1.86.

Of similar import is Petronius 76: *Graeculio, Serapa nomine, consiliator deorum*. The same feeling is also indicated by the verb *graecon* (Horace, *Serm.* 2. 2.11), as well as by *congraecon* and *pergraecon*, found in Plautus.

Men sometimes show the least regard for that to which they owe the most, and this is well illustrated by what two writers, Quintus Curtius and Pliny the Elder, say in regard to the Greeks. Except in so far as Curtius is an interpreter of the acts of Alexander, he is entirely dependent on Greek writers, notably Clitarchus, for his material. Yet in regard to a statement of the latter he says, in 9.5.21, *Tanta componentium vetusta rerum monumenta vel securitas vel, par huic vitium, credulitas fuit*. For comments on the Greeks in general see 4.5.11 *Ut sunt temporaria ingenia*; 3.1.2 *fabulosis Graecorum carminibus*; 8.10.12 *mentiendi. . . . licentiam*. Still more noticeable is the

attitude of Pliny the Elder. To him the Greeks are genus in gloriam suam effusissimum (3.42). Their credulity is unbounded (8.82), and their mendacity is *portentosa* (5.4). Their *fabulae* (5.31), and their *fabulositas* (4.1; 12.11) are equally remarkable. He gives them their full due (2.248), Neque enim subtraham exemplum vanitatis Graecae maximum, and follows this with the story written to his friends on earth by the dead Dionysodorus. All these expressions illustrate *ingenium Romanum*, and become the more interesting when we consider that Pliny himself quotes many an item from Onesicritus, of whom Strabo says (15.1.28 698 C), 'One might call him not more the chief pilot of Alexander than of paradoxes, for he seems to surpass all in wonderology'.

IV

Quintilian (10.1.96) expresses this opinion:

At lyricorum idem Horatius fere solus legi dignus, nam et insurgit aliquando et plenus est iucunditatis et gratiae et variis figuris et verbis felicissime audax.

Audax is one phase of *virtus*, but *gratia* is a Grecian characteristic, as is shown by the contrast in Seneca (Dialogues 11.2.6), Aut Latinae linguae potentia aut Graecae gratia. If we could find the literary measure of *potentia* and *gratia*, it would determine the fundamental difference between the Greek and the Roman. If we take some of the lines which the Romans themselves selected as fittingly expressing their *potentia*, we can feel how little *gratia* there was in them. Take for example the line from Ennius,

Unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem

which was quoted by Cicero, Cato Maior 10, and reproduced with slight variations in Vergil, Aeneid 6.846, or that other line which to Cicero sounded like an oracle (De Republica 5.1).

Moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque.

Or better still, as an extended illustration, take Horace, Carm. 3.30, beginning Exegi monumentum aere perennius. It is as solid and as bare of ornamentation as are the pyramids themselves, and could be used as a good illustration of what Professor Shorey (Horace, Odes and Epodes, Introduction, xx) has called "poverty of epithet". Lucretius (1.136; 1.830; 3.259) speaks of *patrii sermonis egestas*, and this is echoed by Manilius (2.695; 2.897; 3.41; 5.647). But, even if we admit the charge, it applies only to a few points. For an antithetic statement of generic differences, let us take a few of the statements of Quintilian where he discusses *illam gratiam sermonis Attici* (12.10.36):

Non possumus esse tam graciles: sinus fortiores. Subtilitate vincimur: valeamus pondere. Proprietas penes illos est certior: copia vincamus. Ingenia Graecorum etiam minora suos portus habent: nos plerumque maioribus velis moveamur, validior spiritus nostros sinus tendat; non tamen alto semper feramur, nam et litora interim sequenda sunt. Illis facilis per quaelibet vada accessus: ego aliquid, non multo tamen, altius, in quo mea cymba non sidat, inveniam.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,
Nashville, Tennessee.

R. B. STEELE.

REVIEW

How to Observe in Archaeology. Suggestions for Travellers in the Near and Middle East. London: Printed by Order of the Trustees of the British Museum. Oxford University Press (1920). Pp. 103. 2 sh., 6d.

This little book is prepared in a convenient size and form and with a flexible cover so that it can be carried easily in the pocket, and is intended "primarily for the use of travellers . . . who are interested in antiquities without being already trained archaeologists" (5). It is "not meant for experienced archaeologists" (7). Moreover, since it is intended chiefly for English travelers, three pages (26-28) are devoted to a list of the names of the British Archaeological Joint Committee and to a List of the Chief British Institutions and Societies Concerned with the Archaeology of the Near and Middle East. But, as American students are invariably afforded the privileges of British institutions, this fact does not limit its usefulness to travelers from the United States.

The chapters are written by various distinguished English scholars who are masters of their subjects. After the brief Preface, by Sir F. G. Kenyon, and the Introductory Chapter, by G. F. Hill, comes a valuable chapter (II:10-25) on Method, by W. M. Flinders Petrie, in which are also included some important observations on photography, by professional photographers. This chapter is a short abstract of Petrie's book, Methods and Aims in Archaeology, but even a traveler untrained in archaeology would be well advised to take Petrie's book itself rather than rely on the brief outline here given.

Part II of the book (29-94) begins with a chapter on prehistoric flint implements, in which the flints are described and illustrated. This is followed by Chapter II (35-46) on Greece Proper, written by J. P. Droop. In a methodical way the objects characteristic of the important periods and places are briefly described and there is a double page illustration of the types of pottery, and tables showing the many forms of letters which constitute the Greek alphabets of the various periods. This chapter particularly well satisfies the end in view, as much useful information is presented in a clear, convenient, usable form.

On the other hand the next chapter, on Asia Minor, seems to me to be the least satisfactory in the book. The whole subject is condensed into four printed pages and in these pages there is little that can be used either by archaeologist or by casual traveler. To one who has worked in Lydia and is familiar with the artificial burial mounds that rise conspicuously in all directions on the plains, attracting inevitably the interest of all travelers, it is incredible that they should not be mentioned among the monuments of Asia Minor. It is also strange to find no reference to the peculiarly characteristic Lydian pottery, and, in view of the many beautifully executed inscriptions in the Lydian language, found at

Sardes and published in part in 1916, it seems indeed inadequate to devote to the subject of Lydian inscriptions merely the words "letters mostly like Greek capitals (sometimes reversed)". With several exceptions the letters do not at all resemble Greek capitals, and such a description, while it might not mislead the archaeologist, certainly would not assist the layman in the recognition of a Lydian inscription. This chapter should be improved by a statement of the characteristic monuments that the traveler will be certain to see and visit, by a fuller account of the pottery peculiar to the country, and by the reproduction of at least one Lydian and one Lycian inscription. With such additions it would prove more useful to the visitor to Asia Minor and would be of greater value to the archaeological student.

The chapter on Cyprus (IV) is brief (54-58), but the reader is at once referred to the catalogues of the Cyprus Museum, and of the Cypriote collection in the Metropolitan Museum, and, as no intelligent traveler would visit Cyprus without one or both of these works in his equipment, sufficient space is here devoted to the subject.

Chapter VI, on Palestine, and Chapter VIII, on Mesopotamia, are particularly good. In both are briefly listed the visible monuments which should receive the traveler's attention, and both give the periodology of their respective civilizations, with an account of the objects characteristic of each period.

The chapter on Egypt (VII) is so concise as to be of little practical value. The book is concluded with an Index, which is preceded by an Appendix, in which is given an abstract of the laws of antiquities at present in force in Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, and Egypt, together with an outline of a model law of antiquities proposed by an International Committee in Paris for the provinces formerly under Turkish rule.

This book will be carried and used by visitors to the Near East, but its value would be greatly enhanced, without the size becoming burdensome, by an enlargement of several of the chapters, and by an increase in the number of illustrations.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

T. LESLIE SHEAR.

HORACE, ODES 4.6.1-28

Another Study in Punctuation

Professor Knapp's demonstration, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.73, of the correct punctuation of the opening sentence of Lucretius's famous philosophic poem impels me to call attention to a similar phenomenon in the fine ode (4.6), in which Horace invokes divine aid

for the writing of the Carmen Saeculare. The text, with the correct punctuation, is as follows:

- Dive, quem proles Niobea magnae
vindictam linguae Tityosque raptor
sensit et Troiae prope victor altae
Phthius Achilles,
5 ceteris maior, tibi miles impar,
filius quamvis Thetidis marinae
Dardanas turris quateret tremenda
cuspide pugnax—
ille, mordaci velut icta ferro
10 pinus aut impulsus cupressus Euro,
procidit late posuitque collum in
pulvere Teucro;
ille non inclusus equo Minervae
sacra mentito male feriatos
15 Troas et laetam Priami choreis
falleret aulam;
sed palam captis gravis, heu nefas, heu,
nescios fari pueros Achivis
ureret flammis, etiam latentem
20 matris in alvo,
ni tuis victus Venerisque gratae
vocibus divom pater adnuisset
rebus Aeneae potiore ductos
alite muros—
25 doctor argutae fidicen Thaliae,
Phoebe, qui Xantho lavis amne crinis,
Dauniae defende decus Camenae,
levis Agyieus.

It is unessential whether lines 9 to 24 be set off with dashes, with parentheses, or with colons; the point is that they form a parenthetical adornment, describing Achilles, who has been spoken of in verses 3-8. An examination of editions by over forty editors, American, English, French, and German, shows a great preponderance for the period as punctuation after 8, 12, 24. But any scrutiny of the poem makes it evident that there is no principal verb with which the opening vocative *Dive* can be associated, until the seventh stanza is reached; in it the vocative is repeated, and then *defende*, the main verb of the sentence, follows.

Among American editions, only those of C. L. Smith and C. H. Moore make verses 9-24 parenthetical. Among the Teubner text editions there is a variation. Those of Jahn-Schmid (1851) and Nauck (1856) set off 9-24 between dashes, that of L. Müller (1899) puts periods after 8, 12, and 24; that of Vollmer (1906) returns to the (correct) punctuation of Jahn-Schmid and Nauck. Stallbaum and Bond, in their editions, put a colon after 8, but set periods after 12 and 24. There is one curious variation, that of Kiessling³ (1898), who puts a colon after 5, a comma after 8, a semicolon after 12, commas after 16 and 20, and a colon after 24: thus while he recognizes the parenthetical nature of 9-24, he includes with it 6-8, making the *quamvis*-clause qualify *procidit*, 11, rather than *impar*, 5.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.